

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Prior to this amendment, claims 1, 4, 6-18, 22, 23, 26, 28-42 were pending. By way of this amendment, claims 1, 15, 18, and 23 are amended, claim 22 and 37 are canceled, and no claims are added. No new matter is added. Thus, after entry of this amendment, claims 1, 4, 6-18, 23, 26, 28-36, and 38-42 are pending.

Claims 1, 4, 6-18, 22, 23, 26, 28-42 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over *Davis* (U.S. Publication No. 2003/0041077) in view of *Block* (U.S. Publication No. 2005/0182777). This rejection is obviated in view of the amendments to the claims. Each and every limitation of the claims, as amended, is not taught or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination.

Claims 1, 18, and 23

Each and every limitation of claim 1, as amended, is not taught or suggested by the cited references, alone or in combination. For example, claim 1 recites in part:

determining if neither the external metadata describing all data points within said selection is predefined nor the syntax of the external metadata describing all data points within said selection is predefined, and if so creating new internal metadata comprising:

creating a new row or column in the grid;

receiving a formula involving the user selection of a portion of the grid;
entering the formula into a cell in the new row or column; and

repeating the steps of determining if the external metadata describing all data points within said selection is predefined and determining if a syntax of the external metadata describing all data points within said selection is predefined;

The above limitations were generally present in dependent claim 15. In the rejection of claim 15, the Office Action alleges such limitations are taught by *Davis*, Fig. 2, P[0096], and P[0116]. (Office Action, Pg. 20).

Davis describes a system wherein XBRL text documents may be parsed and translated into RDX documents or NDOMs. (*Davis*, P[0062]). The RDX documents and NDOMs may then, by means of an RDX mapper 210, be translated back into XBRL for reporting purposes. (*Davis*, FIG. 2,

P[0065]). The RDX mapper 210 utilizes document templates 214 for mapping instructions. (*Davis* at P[0064]). These document templates 214 are created manually by a user "in a manner similar to a word processor." (*Davis* at P[0063]). Thus, while *Davis* teaches that data may be mapped from one format into another format, *Davis* teaches nothing like the method of claim 1 for assisting a user in creating a mapping, wherein a user is presented with a user interface that provides lists for selecting the external metadata to be mapped. *Davis* more specifically does not teach creating new rows and/or columns in the RDX or NDOM documents, but rather deals with mapping from one format to another. In other words, *Davis* deals with mapping already existing data elements, not creating new ones. *Davis* furthermore does not teach obtaining a formula from a user that relates to a user selection, and entering that formula into a cell in the newly created row and/or column. As explained above, *Davis* does not teach creating new elements, and as such, cannot teach entering a formula into a newly created element.

As to the Office Action's allegation that such limitations are taught or suggested by *Davis*, Fig. 2, P[0096], and P[0116], it is unclear as to where such limitations are described. Fig. 2 of *Davis* is simply a high level diagram of a system. Fig. 2 does not depict adding rows or columns to a grid, or receiving a formula from a user. P[0096] describes a document template that allows users to specify locations of data elements, but to defer the retrieval of the data elements until the document is actually created. Style sheets may be used to apply different formatting, such as showing data in annual columns, quarterly columns, etc. P[0096] in fact teaches the opposite of claim 1. The document templates describe retrieving the data at a later time, however this does not describe creating new data elements in the document template. If the document template describes where to retrieve an element, this means the element must already exist. More specifically, *Davis* does not describe creating new elements and then inserting a user specified formula.

Davis P[0116] describes displaying data elements in different formats, such as time slices. The user specifies a period for an existing date field, and the system produces a report with the proper units. (e.g. 4 periods per year for a quarterly report). First, this does not describe a formula received from the user. The user simply specifies a reporting period, and the formula is defined by that reporting period (e.g. the user does not specify that there are four quarters in a

year). More important though is that the system in *Davis* does not create new data elements (rows or columns) and then, using a user specified formula, populating those cells. In *Davis*, the cell, such as a date field, already exists, and the user is simply specifying its format for display. The user does not create new fields. As such, the limitations of claim 1 as amended, are not taught or suggested by *Davis*.

The addition of *Block* does not resolve this discrepancy. *Block* describes a system for adding labels to data elements in a document. (*Block*, Abstract). The system in *Block* in some cases appears as a printer driver, such that all the data from the source is included in the data stream. (*Block*, P[0034]). Each text string in the input is compared with a known text string, and if a match is found, the text string is labeled accordingly. (*Block*, Fig. 1B, P[0039]). For text strings that are not identified, a user is prompted to select a label. (*Block*, P[0040]). That label is used if an when the text string is encountered in the future. (Id.).

Block does not describe creating new data elements. Just as in *Davis*, *Block* is directed to receiving an already existing input stream, and labeling the already existing elements in that input stream. *Block* does not describe or suggest creating new elements, such as new rows or columns. Furthermore, *Block* does not describe receiving a formula from a user and inserting it into the new row or column. First, *Block* does not create a new row or column, rather *Block* only operates on existing data elements. Second, *Block* does not describe receiving a formula from a user.

Each of the cited references individually does not teach or suggest the limitations of amended claim 1. The combination of the references also does not teach or suggest such limitations. First, neither references describes creating new rows or columns, and the combination would not result in new rows or columns being created. Second, neither references describes receiving a formula from a user, and the combination would not result in a formula being received from the user. Finally, as neither reference describes creating new rows or columns, or receiving a formula from a user, it is not possible for a received formula to be placed in a newly created column.

Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1 and the claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested for reasons including at least those set forth above. The remaining

independent claims have been amended to contain limitations that are similar to those in claim 1, and are allowable for at least some of the same reasons as set forth with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claims 18 and 23 and the claims which depend therefrom is respectfully requested.

Claim 15

Claim 15 has been rewritten in independent form. It is respectfully requested that any new rejection of claim 15 be made non-final as it would not have been necessitated by the amendment. Each and every limitation of claim 15 is not disclosed or suggested by *Davis* or *Block*, alone or in combination. For example, claim 15 recites in part:

receiving from said user a formula involving one or more data items in said grid;

creating a new row or column in said grid;

entering said formula into a cell in said new row or column; and wherein said selection includes said cell.

These limitations are similar to those found in amended claim 1, and are not disclosed or suggested by *Davis* or *Block*, for reasons including at least those set forth above with respect to claim 1. Withdrawal of the rejection of claim 15 is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing, Applicants believe all claims now pending in this Application are in condition for allowance. The issuance of a formal Notice of Allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Further, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment in connection with this paper to Deposit Account No. 20-1430.

If the Examiner believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, please telephone the undersigned at 415-576-0200.

Appl. No. 10/692,525
Amdt. dated March 30, 2010
Reply to Office Action of December 30, 2009

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,

/Preetam B. Pagar/

Preetam B. Pagar
Reg. No. 57,684

TOWNSEND and TOWNSEND and CREW LLP
Two Embarcadero Center, Eighth Floor
San Francisco, California 94111-3834
Tel: 415-576-0200
Fax: 415-576-0300
Attachments
PBP:s7h
62397651 v1